

2008 Indiana Electrical Code Review Committee
April 17, 2008 Meeting Minutes

The meeting convened at 9 am. Raleigh Kouns introduced two guests, Mara Snyder, Director, Legal and Code Services in the Department of Homeland Security and David Hannum, Chairman of the Fire Prevention and Building Safety Commission. Mr. Kouns also introduced new committee members Matt Sigler of CP Morgan and John Weesner representing the IAEI. Returning meeting attendees introduced themselves in turn, and voters from entities with more than one representative in attendance were identified.

Charlie Eldridge made a motion to approve the minutes from the February 19 meeting, and Mr. Weesner seconds the motion. The minutes were approved without change. Copies of the minutes for the March 11 meeting were not available for participants to review, so no action was taken on them.

David Kish asked for a show of hands to identify the number of voting entities present at the start of the meeting; seventeen (17) voters were identified. The committee began discussion of the proposed code changes.

PC-08-44

Mr. Sigler introduced his proposal and discussed why the committee should recommend adopting it. Mr. Weesner made comments in opposition of the proposed change. Jeff Fecteau commented on the intent of requiring the receptacle on the deck, and the various committee members expressed their opinions. Mr. Eldridge read from the applicable section of NFPA's report on comments. David Stalf related that it is common to find receptacles like this in his area. Jim Keller was worried about the implications of this change if someone is adding deck, and there was much discussion about the cost of the requirement and questions regarding where it will apply. The vote in favor of accepting the proposal to eliminate 210.52E (3) was 7 in favor, 10 opposed, with no abstentions; the committee recommends no changes to the model code.

PC-08-32

Mr. Eldridge introduced his proposal and made a motion to approve it; Mr. Weesner seconded his motion. Mr. Kouns commented on the proposed change. The committee discussed methods to insure that an installation one AHJ approves will be recognized by another AHJ at a later time. The vote in favor of accepting the proposal was 14 in favor, 2 opposed with one abstention.

After voting on PC-08-32, Mr. Sigler asked if his proposed change to section 210.12(B) would be considered. Mr. Kouns referred to committee discussion in the January 15, 2008 meeting where we agreed to review previously addressed proposals if new information is brought forward to the committee. Mr. Sigler distributed information to committee members regarding his proposal on 210.12(B). The committee adjourned for a break.

After reconvening, Mr. Kish asked for clarification on voting for PC-08-44; in particular, he identified how each entity voted. Lynn Madden distributed literature to the committee. The committee moved on to consider PC-08-19.

2008 Indiana Electrical Code Review Committee
April 17, 2008 Meeting Minutes

PC-08-19

Mr. Eldridge moved to accept the proposal, and Brian Roberts seconded his motion. Mr. Eldridge pointed out this proposal is similar to PC-08-32. The vote in favor of accepting this proposal was 15 in favor, 1 opposed with a single abstention.

PC-08-20

Mr. Kouns explained that he proposed this change to prevent using an appliance cord as the sole means of bonding gas pipe; this proposal is brought forward from the current Indiana amendments to the electric code. Mike Curry pointed out it can be difficult to work with multiple utility companies that may have different (or additional) bonding requirements. Mr. Eldridge asked why the change is necessary, and Mr. Kouns explained the intent is to provide bonding for gas dryers and gas ranges. Mr. Fecteau asked if the change is necessary since the code requires things to be installed per manufacturer's instructions, and gas dryer instructions say you must bond the appliance. Mr. Weesner provided background from meetings he and Mr. Kouns had with gas companies. Herb Craig suggested simply requiring a bond between the gas line and water pipe. Mr. Stalf had several questions, and Mr. Kouns reiterated the purpose of the change is to be sure an overcurrent device will operate if a (gas) pipe becomes energized. Mr. Eldridge moved to accept the proposal and Mr. Fecteau seconded his motion. The committee voted 15 to 1 in favor of the proposal.

PC-08-05

Mr. Eldridge explained he brought forward the proposal to reduce the risk of fires from lightning events. John Hibner asked if the proposal is an exact duplicate of the requirement in the residential code. Mr. Kouns confirmed the wording agrees with the Indiana Residential Code requirement. Mr. Fecteau expressed concern that this change could conflict with the change we previously approved (PC-08-20); he noted the words "isolation" and "separation" can be confused. Mr. Weesner suggested we table proposed change, make editorial changes and bring it back to the committee to consider in a future meeting. Mr. Weesner moved to table the proposal and Ms. Madden seconded his motion. The vote was 15 in favor with 2 abstentions.

PC-08-28

Mr. Eldridge explained his proposal and acknowledged that exposure to sunlight will produce a temperature rise, but he is not aware of any problems that have resulted from this. Manufacturers' representatives present at the meeting agreed adjusting for this condition may increase wire size and result in a condition where there is insufficient space in equipment for lugs. Mr. Eldridge moved to accept his proposal, and Mr. Roberts seconded his motion. The vote in favor of

2008 Indiana Electrical Code Review Committee
April 17, 2008 Meeting Minutes

accepting the proposal was 5 in favor, 10 opposed with 2 members abstaining; the committee recommends no changes to the model code.

PC-08-22

After a general discussion, Jim Keller made a motion to approve the proposed change, and Alan Manche seconded his motion. The vote in favor of accepting the proposal was 16 in favor with 1 abstention.

Mr. Kouns introduced a guest, Joe Hinesman to the committee.

PC-08-23

Mr. Weesner's motion to approve the change was seconded by Mr. Eldridge. Marlie Pedtke noted that the text in the proposed change is unclear. Mr. Weesner withdrew his motion, and Ms. Madden seconded his motion. Mr. Kouns will correct the text of the proposed change.

Committee members discussed changing the proposed May meeting date because of a scheduling conflict for several group members. Mr. Eldridge made a motion to retain the May meeting date (May 13 meeting, proposed code changes due by May 2). The motion was seconded and passed. The committee adjourned for lunch.

The committee reconvened, and Brooke Burnett (representing REMCs) joined the group. Joe Pavia left the meeting after lunch, so the number of voting members remained at seventeen (17).

PC-08-23

Mr. Kouns distributed a corrected version of the proposed change. Mr. Weesner moved to approve the change, and Mr. Eldridge seconded the motion. The vote in favor of accepting the proposal, as changed, was 12 in favor, 4 opposed with a single abstention.

PC-08-24

Mr. Eldridge moved to approve the change, and Mr. Weesner seconded his motion. The vote in favor of accepting the proposal was 10 in favor, 3 opposed with 4 abstentions.

PC-08-25

Mr. Eldridge moved to approve the change, and Mr. Weesner seconded his motion. The vote in favor of accepting the proposal was 11 in favor, 2 opposed with 4 abstentions.

PC-08-26

2008 Indiana Electrical Code Review Committee
April 17, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Eldridge moved to approve the change, and Mr. Weesner seconded his motion. The vote in favor of accepting the proposal was 12 in favor, 3 opposed with 2 abstentions.

PC-08-45

Mr. Sigler began to discuss his proposal for Article 406, and he indicated the sections he would like to amend are 406 .8 (A) and (B) (1). He modified the "reason" section to state:

There is no data that I can find to substantiate the receptacles used currently are insufficient to provide life safety.

Mr. Eldridge stated that, based on his experience, we should not change the code. Mr. Fecteau stated the impetus for the code change was the desire to keep up with a UL standard. He explained the need for UV protection and for protection from dampness.

Mr. Sigler asked that the committee consider his change for only 406.8(A) (as originally written).

Mr. Eldridge provided information to the committee from NFPA's report on proposals. Mr. Sigler made a motion to approve the change, and it was seconded by Ms. Madden. The vote in favor of accepting the proposal was 4 in favor, 11 opposed with 1 member abstaining; the committee recommends no changes to the model code.

Mr. Keller left the meeting during the discussion of PC-08-45, so the number of voting members became sixteen (16).

PC-08-12

Mr. Eldridge discussed his proposed change and indicated he didn't feel tamper resistant (TR) receptacles are necessary in homes. Mr. Fecteau provided background on the basis for including TR receptacles in the electric code. Ms. Snyder asked about the cost of the receptacles, and Mr. Fecteau said the incremental cost is \$0.50. Mr. Sigler asked why the receptacles are required in dwelling units and not other areas. Mr. Fecteau referred to the NEMA study from Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) data showing 71% of electrical incidents involving children happened in the home. Jeff Dean mentioned that daycare centers don't have requirements for outlets along walls (as is the case in a dwelling unit), so the need for TR receptacles is reduced in these occupancies.

The committee discussed the difficulty older adults may have using the TR outlets. Other discussion topics included a suggestion that TR receptacles could be an upgrade for people when renovating and the need for TR outlets at heights below 48 inches. Mr. Manche discussed a committee member's

2008 Indiana Electrical Code Review Committee
April 17, 2008 Meeting Minutes

suggestion that lifestyle and furnishings have an impact on the need for TR outlets; he suggests that "lifestyle" isn't a good way to make a decision.

Ms. Madden moved to approve the change, and it was seconded by Ms. Burtnett. The vote in favor of accepting the proposal was 6 in favor and 10 opposed; the committee recommends no changes to the model code

PC-08-21

Mr. Eldridge withdrew his proposal.

PC-08-09

Ms. Madden moved to reject the change, and it was seconded by Mr. Sigler. The vote in favor of rejecting the proposal was 12 in favor with 4 abstentions.

PC-08-33

Ms. Madden moved to reject the change, and it was seconded by Ms. Burtnett. Ensuing discussion emphasized that the proposal, as written, was unclear. Mr. Eldridge offered to contact Alan Nadon and work to rewrite the proposal. The vote to reject the proposal was 12 in favor and 1 opposed with 2 abstentions.

Ms. Madden questioned why the committee reviewed PC-08-33 since it is addressed in the new residential code. Mr. Fecteau and Mr. Sigler left the meeting for other appointments after voting on this proposal.

PC-08-34

Mr. Weesner made a motion to approve the proposed change, and Mr. Manche seconded his motion. The vote was 10 in favor and 2 opposed with 2 abstentions.

PC-08-27

Ms. Madden made a motion to approve the proposed change, and Mr. Eldridge seconded her motion. The vote was 9 in favor and 2 opposed with 3 abstentions.

Following discussion of PC-08-27, Mr. Eldridge made a motion to adjourn; Mr. Roberts seconded the motion. The committee unanimously voted in favor of the proposal.